

**STATEMENT OF REP. EDWARD J. MARKEY (D-MA)**  
**HOUSE FLOOR DEBATE**  
**IRAQ RESOLUTION**  
**October 10, 2002**

**Mr. Speaker:** The President has asked this Congress to support action that foresees the possibility of sending our loved ones -- our sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors -- into combat in a foreign land. No more serious a decision ever faces Congress.

The threat that we confront is Saddam Hussein. Saddam is in a category of his own. No other head-of-state has been the subject of an 11-year international campaign to disarm and sanction him. He has invaded two of his neighbors, assassinated 16 of his own family members, tried to assassinate former President Bush, lied about his weapons buildup, fired missiles at Israel, and gassed his own people. The prospect that such a despot has biological and chemical weapons -- anthrax, sarin gas, smallpox -- and is nearing nuclear capability is a looming threat to millions.

We as a nation have the responsibility to stop him.

I would have preferred that we proceed in the manner outlined in the Spratt substitute, which would have given the President all the authority needed at this time to disarm Saddam. The Spratt substitute would have allowed the UN to proceed with tough "anytime-anywhere" inspections, given the UN the military backing to make those inspections work, and ensured that Saddam Hussein lost his capacity to threaten the world.

Unfortunately, the Spratt substitute failed, and we are now faced with a vote, up or down, on the broader resolution negotiated between the White House, Minority Leader Gephardt, and others.

This too would accomplish the goal of giving the President sufficient authority to enforce UN resolutions regarding Iraq, particularly those that address the continuing threat posed by Iraq's possession and development of chemical, biological and nuclear capabilities.

Although this is a broader resolution than the Spratt resolution, I will vote for it because it represents the best remaining hope of disarming Saddam. While the resolution does not require it, the President has said that it is his intention to continue to work towards a new UN resolution that can make the inspections program effective.

The President initially resisted going to the UN, but he changed course. He initially resisted coming to Congress to explain his purpose and to seek our support, but he changed course. We should respect the distance he has traveled towards a

multilateral, measured process that includes the UN. We should support him as long as he remains on that course.

I do so today knowing full well this administration's record on the issue of nonproliferation, arms control and multilateral treaties has often been incomprehensible. At times he has spoken and acted as if he would prefer to act without allies and without the UN. Several weeks ago, the President announced a strategic doctrine that embraces the "preemptive use of force" as its touchstone. This new Bush Doctrine is dangerous and destabilizing in its own right. It makes it harder to hold together the fragile international coalition on which we rely for success in the ongoing war on terror.

The contradictions and double-standards that define his non-proliferation policy are particularly troubling. His "Axis of Evil" speech, for example, lumped together Iraq, Iran and North Korea in a turn of the phrase that is hard to untie. They have all been accused of attempting to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Yet our response in Iran is not to use force, but to complain to the Russians about their sale of reactors to Iran that could facilitate the acquisition of nuclear weapons. And in North Korea, our response is to make our own sale of nuclear reactors to that country. The President has also failed to seek Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban, pursued new nuclear weapons like the earth penetrating warheads, and turned his back on the biological weapons convention. This makes no sense and belies a lack of any coherent policy at all.

It is certainly true that George W. Bush is not the first president to be self-contradictory regarding weapons of mass destruction. I have spent considerable effort during the last 26 years working to prevent the constant undermining of nonproliferation policy by both Democratic and Republican administrations. The Carter Administration shipped nuclear fuel to India notwithstanding that country's ongoing undeclared nuclear weapons program. The Reagan Administration condemned Israel in the UN for destroying Saddam's Osirak nuclear reactor. The same administration promoted nuclear trade with the apartheid regime in South Africa. Both President Reagan and President Clinton allowed trade with Communist China to trump efforts to stop China from retransferring nuclear materials and technology to Pakistan.

Now it is the Bush administration that fails to connect the dots of weapons proliferation. When he promotes nuclear reprocessing, or tritium production for bombs in commercial reactors, he undermines nonproliferation. When he allows the export of sensitive nuclear technology, discards the comprehensive test ban treaty, or fails to negotiate progressive measures leading to global disarmament – as mandated by Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – he strengthens the proliferators.

These decisions come back to haunt us when, as now, we find that diplomatic options are exhausted and the use of force appears necessary.

**But even as our overall nonproliferation policy keeps lurching from side to side, the United States and the international community have, in the particular case of Iraq, remained focused for more than a decade on the very real menace of Saddam's drive to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction against his perceived enemies.**

**Now, after 11 years of insufficient inspections and sanctions, we cannot stand idle. Something has to change. We have nearly exhausted the non-violent alternatives. The sanctions are contributing to a significant loss of innocent life daily. Saddam has built up his chemical and biological weapons capacities during this period and he has missiles to deliver a nuclear payload and the money to buy it. It is apparent that but for our demonstration of resolve to follow through on the UN-sponsored goal of disarming him, Saddam Hussein intends to make good on his pledge to acquire nuclear weapons.**

**I wish the resort to force were unnecessary and, if the inspections can be made effective, armed conflict can still be avoided. But while force is a last resort, it is an option that cannot be ruled out if we intend to deal effectively with Saddam Hussein.**

**Thank you.**

**####**